

194 Tones appear to be lacking in a few members of the family, notably in the generally archaic West Tibetan dialects (Balti and Purik), hence only a tendency to develop tonal systems rather than a tonal system itself can definitely be postulated for the parent speech. Monosyllabic roots, however, of the type *k'wi "dog", *mig "eye", *ni "sun, day", are of absolute diagnostic value. The phonemic scheme of the parent language seems to have been relatively simple. The stop and affricate series included both aspirated and unaspirated surds and at least one sonant member. To these were added four nasals (ng, ^hn, n, m), probably four sibilants (s, z, ^hš, ^hž), the liquids l and r, and consonantal y, w, and h. The final consonants, however, were limited to -g, -d, -b; -ng, -n, -m; -r, -l, and probably -s. Initial consonantal clusters were restricted to combinations of stops, affricates, sibilants, or nasals + r, l, or y, e.g. kl-, mr-, py-, but prefixed groupings complicated the anlaut in many roots, making possible forms such as Tib. brgyad "8". The vocalic system included a, i, and u, probably with a simple "long" vs. "short" quantitative distinction, and e and o, which seem secondary in many instances. The parent language also had diphthongs both of rising type, e.g. wa (ua), wi (ui), and of falling type, e.g. su, ei, the latter type appearing only in final position, as in *ta'au "fat", *mei "fire".

● 193 On the morphological side the parent Tibeto-Burman speech showed almost as great simplicity. It was primarily a prefixing language with isolating characteristics and a

193 fixed word order: subject + object + verb. The verbal prefix apparatus, which is especially prominent in Tibetan and Kachin, consisted of "subjective" prefixes m-, b-, and "directive" prefixes d-, g-, r-, l-, s-. The s- prefix often appears as a true causative morpheme, as in Kachin in the form *sa*, *ḍsa*, e.g. *bra* "to be scattered", *sa-bra* "to scatter"; *k'rit* "to fear", *ḍsa-k'rit* "to frighten", and in Burmese, in which the initial of the transitive form has been aspirated by the loss of prefixed s-, e.g. *pran* "to be full", *p'ran* "to fill"; *lwat* "to be free", *hlwat* "to set free". Prefixed m- is "stative" (neutral), as in Tib. *mnam-pa* "to smell, stink", *mt'o-ba* "to be high", often with reflexive force, as in Tib. *mnab-pa* "to put on garments, dress oneself". This prefix seems to represent an ancient demonstrative pronoun, which still functions independently in Meithei (Manipuri) and can be traced elsewhere. It often imparts substantival value, e.g. *m-sin (Tib. *mṭs'in*) "liver" "its-bitter (sin)-part" (see the discussion in Benedict, 1939). Kachin *pyen* "to fly", *ma-pyen* "wings" < "its-flying", *rut* "to rub", *ma-rut* "a grater" < "its-rubbing". In many instances prefixes occurring with substantival forms cannot be analyzed, e.g. *r-mei "tall", *d-gu "9", while occasionally there is fluctuation in prefix usage, e.g. *l-nga or *b-nga "5".

601 The existence of the m- pronominal prefix discussed
193 above is of some importance in the analysis of kinship terms in Tibeto-Burman. Kinship terms, like words for parts of the

body, are especially susceptible to prefixation of this ⁶⁰¹ type. Thus Meithei has *ma-pa* "father", *ma-ma* "mother" just ¹⁹³ as it has *ma-sa* "body", *ma-mei* "tail", *ma-hau* "fat", *ma-hei* "fruit", etc. The most widespread prefix of this type is the prefix *a-*, as in Tib. *'a-p'a* "father", *'a-ma* "mother", Lepcha *a-bo* "father", *a-mo* "mother", Kachin *a-wa* "father", *a-nu* "mother", Burmese *a-o's* "father", *a-ma'* "mother". As Laufer has shown, this *a-* prefix usage extends even into Chinese. In Tibetan this prefix is used only with kinship terms, but in Kachin, Burmese, and some of the Kukiish languages it has retained its old pronominal function in its use with words for parts of the body, e.g. Southern Chin *a-si'* "eye", *a-ho* "tooth" along with *a-no* "father", *a-nu* "mother", and Lhota Naga *o-k'a* "hand", *o-pok* "belly" along with *o-po* "father", *o-pvu* "mother" (Lhota *o < a*). Giffenden (1929, pp. 177 and ff.) sought to distinguish between pronominal and non-pronominal usages of this prefix, but failed to note its use with parts of the body in Kachin (e.g. *a-mun* "hair of the body", *a-nu* "brain") and in Burmese (e.g. *a-mwe*³ "hair of the body", *a-mri*³ "tail"), hence his argument must be discarded in toto. A third prefix of pronominal origin, *k-* or *ka-*, is also used with relationship terms, e.g. Kachin *ka-wa* "(his) father" along with *n-wa* "(your) father" and *a-wa* "(its) father" and *wa* "father", Thado (Khongzai dialect) *ka-pa* "father", *ka-nu* "mother". In the separate discussions that follow, pronominal prefixes of this type will be enclosed within parentheses, e.g. Tib. (*'a-*)*p'a* "father".

601

193

In striking contrast to this rather elaborate prefix apparatus Tibeto-Burman shows almost no true morphological suffixation. A characteristic "final dental morphology", however, appears in Tibetan, Kachin and elsewhere and undoubtedly must be postulated for the parent speech. In this series Tibetan has -n, -d, and -s, the latter in some instances derived from -ds. Cf. the following examples: Tib. za-ba, gza-ba "to eat", gzan-pa "to eat, devour, gnaw", bzan "food of animals, pasturage", zan "pap, fodder", zas "food, nourishment", and Kachin sa "to eat", sat "boiled rice", i.e. "food"; Tib. bgo-ba "to put on clothes", gon-pa "to put on clothes; clothing", gos "garment"; Tib. dro-ba "to be warm, warm, warmth", dro, dros "the hot part of the day", dros-pa "heated", dron-mo "warm", dros "warmth, heat". As indicated by the above series, these derivatives in -n, -d, -s are often substantival, the typical formation being of the type na-ba "to be ill", nad "disease". The connection between the verbal root and the derived form with final dental is not always clear, especially in languages in which this morphology no longer functions, e.g. Burmese na "to be ill", nat "demon" < "spirit of disease" (see the discussion in Benedict, 1939). The importance of this morphology in connection with kinship terminology will be made clear in the discussion of the Tibetan system.

197

The classification of the Tibeto-Burman languages presents a number of serious problems which admit of no solution at the present time. The general picture is much

SA a phonemic system, in which similar integration appears. The
121 point is not worth elaborating, since the fact that a kinship
601 terminology does constitute a system hardly relieves us of the
ST task of investigating each element of that system, both inde-
121 pendently and correlatively.
601

In any piece of historical reconstruction, linguistic or
other, the natural tendency is to make the prototype unduly
complex. The writer has often been struck by the complexities
shown by hypothetical reconstructed languages as compared with
their actual living descendants, as though linguistic evolution
always proceeded in the direction of simplification. The number
of distinct roots assigned to these reconstructed languages is
sometimes of staggering magnitude, and no ingenuity is spared
in augmenting this lexicographical harvest. In the present
study it would be easy to reconstruct an archaic nomenclature
with two or more terms for most relationships, yet such a
procedure patently would be futile. It is far better to
determine, firstly, which elements are relatively certain,
and, secondly, which elements are based largely on "partial
equations" and must thus be held in reserve until a basic

SA framework has been set up. Nine roots, eight of which are
601 applied to consanguineal relatives, stand out in our complete
● 193 Tibeto-Burman series as called from the foregoing review.
197 These roots constitute the following system
ST
601
193
197

SA

601

● 193

197

ST

601

193

197

Tibeto-Burman Terms

*p'i g'

*p'u g'

*m H

*p'a f

*m PM

*k'u m

*m yob

*m Ch

*m k Sl

The forms given above can be accepted with some confidence as fair approximations of the archaic Tibeto-Burman roots. All except the affinal term *m k have vocalic finals, and it was on the basis of finals or "rhymes" (medial vowel + final consonant), especially of vocalic finals, that Shefer and the writer were able to work out the main features of Tibeto-Burman phonology. Earlier writers had in general attacked the problem from the most difficult angle, that of initials and tones. Thus, no less a scholar than Laufer is responsible for the following absurd dictum:

Prefixes as well as final consonants....are of minor importance in the comparative study of Indo-Chinese languages.... the stuff of comparison remains the initial consonant and the tone conditioned by it. (TP 17, p. 115).

Prefixes have shown to be of basic importance, while both the initials and the tones have been so influenced by the prefixes that our analysis of them still lags far behind our analysis of the finals. In the above set of terms, however, the only problems in the initials concern the aspiration or lack of aspiration, voicing or unvoicing, of the stop initials of *p'i, *p'u, *p'a, and *k'u. English has *pi g' and *pu g'.

SA but initial aspiration is not well preserved in this group.
 601 Mikir has p'i gL, p'u gF, hu < *k'u MB, but po < *pa F.
 193 Meithei, which ordinarily preserves aspiration, has pu gF,
 197 pa F, and hu F1 (< MB). Kachin has hu HF (< MB) rather than
 ST the anticipated *k'u, and Burmese has (sta-)kui o3 rather than
 601 *k'ui. Tibetan has p'yi gL, p'a F, and k'u FB (< MB), while
 193 both Tibetan and Kachin have p'u o3 (< gF). It may be that
 197 one or more of these roots had a sonant rather than a surd
 initial. Initial g-, a rare element in our comparative
 material, is perhaps indicated for the MB root (*gu ~ *g'u),
 but at present nothing definite can be said on this point.

Only one of the above terms is uncertain as regards
 final, viz. *ni F31. Classical Tibetan has ne rather than
 *ni, and Meithei has nen ~ ne rather than *ni, both of which
 point to an archaic form *nei rather than *ni. The weight of
 evidence, however, speaks in favor of the reconstruction *ni,
 from which *nei may have been developed as a doublet root; cf.
 Kukiish *nan yoh, *nou "young, tender", which tend to be con-
 fused (vide pt. 15).

The basic gF terms *p'i and *p'u are found together in
 Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Hru, Kukiish, and Burmish-Loloish (but
 p'e³ gF < *p'i in Burmese itself, which has a new term
 [p'wa³] for gF). The root *p'i is further retained in its
 basic meaning in Tibetan, Mursi (perhaps Tibetan loan-word),
 Baking, and Vayu, while Chang has retained it in the meaning
 "gF". In northern TS groups the root *p'u has been applied

SA to oB, viz. in Tibetan, Limbu, Newari (only in combination),
601 Digaro, and Kachin. This semantic interchange also appears
●193 in Burmish-Loloish, viz. Moso p'u gF, bu oB, Nyi bu gF, bu oB.
197 The interplay of surd and sonant initials in these Moso and
ST Nyi forms indicates that doublets are involved. In Barish
601 the root *p'i g (in the form bi) has been applied to oSi,
193 both in the Bodo-Dimass and Garo divisions of this group,
197 and also retained in its basic meaning. It is clear that
these usages are connected with the especial position held
by oB, and that the gF terms function here simply as honor-
ifics. Other TB roots, less widely distributed than the
above, show the same type of semantic shift (vide infra).
In societies with a patrilineal bias it is only natural that
the role of oB should be of more significance than that of
oSi, thus perhaps accounting for the relative stability of
*p'i as compared with *p'u. It can hardly be without
significance that in the single matrilineal group encountered
(Barish) the term *p'i gV should have been applied to oSi,
in contrast to all other TB groups.

Of the two basic P terms *p'a F and *p'u M, the former
is the most widely distributed and shows fewer variations.
The following groups have this root (*p'a): Tibetan, Kanauri,
Byangsi, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Miri, Dhimal, Burmish-
Loloish, Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, and Kukish.
This root commonly appears as a masculine affix, but no
instance of a transference to "oB" has been uncovered. The

SA root *ma M appears in Tibetan, Kanauri, Bahing, Vayu, Newari,
601 Lepcha, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Barish, and Meithei. In
193 Burmese itself it is retained only in the terms ma' Si and
197 a-ma' "feminine suffix", and in the closely-related Maru only
ST in the meaning "MSi". Yru has preserved this root only in
601 the feminine suffix -ma. A transference to the meaning "oSi"
193 is found in the contiguous North Assam groups Dafla and Aka.
197 In Kachin and the extensive Kukish group this root appears
to have vanished without leaving a trace.

The two PSb terms *ni and *k'u are also unequally
represented in Tibeto-Burman. The root *ni FSi is of almost
universal occurrence. In its basic meaning it appears in
Tibetan, Gyarung, Kanauri, Thebor, Vayu, Newari, Abor-Miri,
Nung, Burmish-Loloish (but not in Burmese itself), Konyak,
Barish, Mikir, Meithei, and Kukish. Kachin has retained it
only in the affinal meaning "WM". Aka, if we can trust our
inadequate sources, has applied this root to M, while Limbu
has applied it to oSi. Replacement by the term for "oSi"
is seen in Dafla, Sho, Changki (Ao), and probably Kadu,
while Mongsan (Ao) shows replacement by the term for "oSb".
The Dafla material indicates that this is an analytical
development ("oSi of F"). Lepcha equates FSi with "Si in
the term nyu ~ nyo, applied to female relatives in the uterine
line. This unusual equation also appears in Bahing, which
has mo-mo MSi, FSi (from mo < *ma M), and po-po FB (from
po < *pa F), yet has ku-ku MB. Distinct terms have been

SA developed in Kachin (moi), which preserves *mai* as an affinal
601 term (WZ), and in Burmese (P1³), but *mai* is retained in the
●193 closely related Maru. The Dimas term *da-de* P51 (*be-de* MB)
197 is likewise distinct.

ST
601 The much more restricted root *k'u MB is found in its
193 primary meaning in Buhing, Vayu, Abor-Miri, Daffa, Digaro,
197 Nung, Mikir, and Ao. Tibetan has k'u PB, but *skud* < *k'u Fl, Bl.
Himalayish and Lepcha also have k'u PB, probably because of
Tibetan influence. Kachin, Meithei, Ntenyi Rengma, and Anyo
Rengma have retained the term in the affinal meaning "HF"
(Meithei Fl), and Sema in the affinal meaning "FSH". Chang
(Konyak) has the form *ho* MB, which cannot with certainty be
connected with this root. In the Burmish-Loloish group we can
cite only Burmese *hni* "prefix used with names of persons older
or of higher rank than the speaker, or politely of his equals"
(*ats-hni* cB), Akha *a-hō* B, Ahi *hō-pu-li* ySiH, and Mosa *a-gu* Bl.
The Mosa usage is paralleled in the Barish group, where we
find Bodo *gu-mai*, Gero *gu-me* Bl. This root cannot be traced
in the Eaki languages proper, yet can be reconstructed for
Rukish on the basis of the Naga terms (*supra*), and for Rukie
in general on the basis of the Mikir and Meithei terms.

The root **nau* yB, occasionally applied either to yB or
ySi alone, also to Ch, is well represented in Tibeto-Burman.
It appears in the following groups: Tibetan (*nu* ~ *no*), Byangai
(yB), Limbu, Lepcha, Aka, Kachin, Konyak, Barish (ySi), Meithei,
Mru (yB), and Rukish (yB ~ Ch). The most conspicuous gaps are
those in Abor-Miri-Daffa, Nung, and Burmish-Loloish.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

The eighth and last of the basic consanguineal terms is *wa* Ch, which is found in Tsangla, Magari, Miju, Aka, Hachin, Mada, Mung (as *ed* D), Pyu, Burmish-Loloish, Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, and Mukiish (rarely used for ysb, as in Peeren and Pyaw). Lepcha has *a-so* < *wa* gzf, *a-son* gCh (with suffixed *-a*). This root is conspicuously absent in Tibetan and its dialects (but present in Tsangla, a Bodish language), Himalayish, and Kiranti, i.e. the northern or northwestern band of Tibeto-Burman languages, as well as in the Abor-Miri-Dafia group.

The affinal term *mak* Sl appears in Tibetan, Lepcha (*< mak*), Dhimal (*< mak*), Miri, Hachin (*da-ma* < **d-mak*), Burmese (*sa-mak*), Meithei, Mru, and Mukiish, with an additional uncertain occurrence in Byangai. In view of our generally inadequate data on affinal nomenclatures (e.g. we do not have the term for "Sl" in Mung, where we should expect to find this root), the widespread distribution of this root is of increased significance. It would appear that the root is lacking in Himalayish, Mikir, Konyak, and Barish.

The above set of basic terms is supplemented by a series of roots of restricted distribution. Some of these serve mainly as replacements for the basic roots, while others are functionally more independent. Since our set of basic terms is not complete, we must assume that some of these roots represent archaic Tibeto-Burman elements, but this point is best discussed after the various secondary roots have been analyzed.

SA

601

193

197

ST

601

193

197

The g^F roots *p'i g^M and *p'u g^F have no serious rivals in Tibeto-Burman. A curious link between Tibetan and Southern Kuki is suggested by the following set of terms: Tib. po ~ spo g^F (literary or dialectical), rmo g^M (literary), and Sho a-pō ~ a-pōk g^F, Chinson ka-mo g^M, Yindu ka-mo g^F. A possible root *si is indicated by Balti as-si (= a-si) gg^M, Nung a-si g^M, Khami a-u-si g^F, and Kadu a-si MSi (i-si "woman"), Yindu ka-si PSI, Sho a-si PSI, oSi (cf. the roots *ta and *tel, infra). In general, g^F terms show more variation than do P terms; thus, Kachin has developed distinct terms for both g^M (woi) and g^F (ji), and note forms such as Byangsi ti-ti g^F, Bahing and Vayu ki-ki g^F.

The most conspicuous of the secondary P roots is *nu M, which appears in Kachin, Miju, Sak, Konyak, Kukiish, and perhaps Mikir and Meithei (in combination). The root *pui "mother, female" is restricted to Mikir and Kukiish. The Kukiish feminine affix *la, used especially of young females, seems to have given rise to Mongsen-Changki (Ao) a-la M, Ntenyi Rengma a-la gg^M, Anyo Rengma a-la g^M, and cf. Byangsi la-la g^M, Sumwari a-la Si. The same root (*la) appears in Kachin, Burmish-Loloish, and elsewhere as a masculine affix. The Tibeto-Burman root *wa "male" serves to explain both Bunan and Kachin wa, Kadu a-wa, Garo (dialects of A type) a-wa P (Moshang and Mamsang wa P probably through Kachin influence), Aka ay < *a-wa P, Burmese wa-kri³ "term of address to old man" (Arawakan dialect), and Lepcha a-vo < *wa, Meithei (ma-)wa, Kukiish wa H; cf. also Digaro ma-wa "male".

SA Rhimal -wa "masculine suffix", Bodo hwa "male". Some of
601 these forms, however, may have resulted from a phonetic
● 193 development from *p'a F (probably via *ba).

197 A root *wai or *wa appears sporadically in Tibeto-Burman,
ST sometimes with a dental suffix. This root is parallel to,
601 but distinct from, TB *wa M. The following forms belong here:
193 Tibetan -med "woman" (in bud-med < *bu-med, paralleling
197 bu-smad), Gyarung to-mi ~ to-mo "woman", Kansaui -med (suffix
in "D" and "M"), Chamba Lahuli me "bitch", Limbu met W,
Lepcha a-mit "woman", Edo a-me M, Nung a-me M (cf. Nung
a-p'e F), Burmese a-mi ~ a-me M, and Garo me-cik "woman,
wife". Note also the series formed by Burmese sa-mi³, Aka
sa-mi, Nung sa-mi D (from *sa Ch). Garo ga-me Bl, Mikir
me SiH correspond phonetically but can scarcely be fitted
in otherwise.

In addition to the above, there are traces of a set of
roots *ya and *yu, both applied to female relatives. The
former is better attested than the latter; cf. Himalayish
(Machatti, Kansaui, Chamba Lahuli) ya M, Aber-Miri and Dafia
yo < *ya gu (but in Pagri Miri used for "M" in address),
Tehlung (Konyak group) ya M, Naga *ya M, also Kansaui yas,
Rai (Kiranti) me-ya, Burmese me-ya³ W, Digarp mi-ya "woman",
ha-mi-ya W. The root *yu is represented only by Kansaui
yu-med, Khamtu (Kiranti) yuh, Lepcha a-ya W, Lepcha th-yu
"woman", and perhaps Tibetan yu-mo "female of a stag".

Nothing has yet been said of oSb terms, which show a
wide variety of forms contrasting with the standard ySb root (*mau)

SA Much of the material in this connection is of a scattered
601 nature from which it is difficult to draw any conclusions.
● 193 Thus, Byangsi hya, Bahing ya oB, Maithai ya-ma oB, Chawte
197 (Old Ruki) a-ya B, ai-ya oSi, and Khami ya-st ~ ya-d oB
ST suggest an archaic root *ya oB, yet this same element appears
601 in another setting (supra). Burmese ats-kui < *ik-kui oB,
193 Mikir ik oB lack cognates elsewhere, as do Maru pai oSi,
197 Ghonbok pai oSi(wa), unless the latter pair be connected with
Burmese a-pai "madam" and perhaps Mikir pai ~ pe M. The
characteristic Rukish root u oBb (Central, Northern, and Old
Ruki groups only) does not appear elsewhere in this setting,
yet appears to be identical to Rha ũ M, Tawngtha u W, Yru u M,
and Burmese u³ MB (prefixed to names of men considerably older
than the speaker), perhaps also Tawngthul a-o³ g³ MB.

Three or four roots, however, stand out more prominently
than the above lot and deserve especial consideration.
Tibetan c'e oSi(wa) has been compared with Himalayish *e'e
"female" as represented by Khamuri c'ets "female, woman",
Khamshi c'ets v (with diminutive suffix -ts) and with the
Byangsi-Chaudangsi term c'e xC, as well as with Johar a-ee F^u
The above terms all point to a TB root *e'ed. A similar
root, but apparently with unaspirated initial (*eei), is
represented by Konyak jei ~ eei oBb ~ oB, Maithai ee oSi,
Tawngthul eei oBb, Western Ruki *eei oBb, Anye Rengma a-ee oBb.
The Tioetan term appears to be etymologically connected with
the word c'e-ba "great", from which the respectful term
geen-po oB has been developed.

SA 1 Root *aa oSi appears in Mura, Vayu, Kachin, Andro, and
601 Konyak, while the Alure and Aber-Miri-Dafla groups have *aa M,
193 and Lahm has the vocative term i-aa M. Tibetan maa D1
197 perhaps also belongs here, though it may be of periphrastic
ST origin (< maa "cath").
601

193 The Tibeto-Burman root *ta (often in the form da) is
197 consistently applied to relatives older than Ego, if one
regards the Baping-Vayu root *ta CH as of distinct origin.
The following terms can be grouped with this root: Tibetan
'a-ta F (dialectal), oS (Eastern Tibet), Taangla a-ta oS,
Gyung a-ta-ta F, Johar a-ta oSi, Byangsi ta-ta oSi, Nowari
ta-ta oSi, Miri and Dafla a-te < *ta gF, Digaro ta gF, da oS,
Burmese t'a³-t'a³ F (dialectal), Akha a-ta F, Independent
Lolo a-ta F, Shp a-ta oS, Chinlon (ha-)t'a oS, Ihta a-ta oSb,
Changki (As) a-ta FSI, oSi, Naong Hongma a-da PoB. Doublet
forms are found only in Digaro (ta gF, da oS). Unlike *p'u
gF, oS this root has also been applied to F in some languages
(Tibetan, Gyung, Burmese, Akha). Degeodins describes the
Tibetan term 'a-ta as a "children's word" (vex puerorum),
and in Independent Lolo a distinction is made between a-ta F
(used by children) and a-bu ~ a-bo F (used by adults).

Kamuri te-te gF, a-te oS are clearly of a type paralleling
that described above. The suggested TB root is *tai, with
which can be grouped Byangsi te-te xC(es), Dafla t^u-t^u FyE, oS
(in different sources), Kadu a-te oSi, Bangara a-tai oS,
Mikir te oSi(ve), Meithei i-tai-ma oSi, and Hru a-tai BW.

SA

601

● 193

197

ST

601

193

197

An objection might be raised to the above discussion on the ground that forms such as *na, *ta, and *tai (te) are of "nursery word" type and should not be regarded as representing actual TB roots. The writer himself originally ascribed to this general point of view, but the collection of material on which this study is based has led him to discard it. Thus, ta F appears both in the West Tibetan dialects (Galti, Furik) and in the monad dialects of Eastern Tibet, as well as in the aberrant Gyarung language, whence we can safely infer a Bodish root *ta F. The term na oSi appears in five distinct languages representing two different foxi (Murai-Wayu and Kachin-Andro-Konyak), and na M in two isolated groups (Almora and Abor-Miri-Dafila). Distributions of this type are scattered, to be sure, yet not entirely random. The cluster of connotations (gP, P, oSb) around these roots is also not without significance.

The majority of the terms for Sb(ds) are of limited distribution. Tibetan sring-mo Si(ms), dialectically used for ySi, appears also in Himalayish (Si) and Byangai (ySi), with an additional possible occurrence in Dhimal-Toto (Si). Kachin jan < *jar Si(ms), often used for ySi, is directly related to Kukish *izar Si(ms), which in Western Kuki is used for ySi, and to Meithei i-cal ~ i-can ySi, Kadu san, Sengmai cal ySi. Kachin yung B(ws) has been compared with the Garo-Dimasa root *yung yB. The tendency to equate Sb(ds) with ySb is reflected in all three roots.

The roots *nau ySb and *xa Gh are of almost universal occurrence and have no serious rivals. The former is

SA conspicuously absent in Burmish-Loloish, which has a root
601 *nyi (ní), comparable with Ləpcha nyi-t'i gCh. A root *nga is
● 193 suggested by Murai and Gurung a-nga ySi, Miri ŋng-ā ySb,
197 Dafia ang-a Ch, Naga *nga Ch. Isolated roots *a Ch and *ka Ch
ST are represented by Digaro a, Abor-Miri o < a Ch, and Newari
601 ka, Abor-Miri ko < *ka Ch, respectively.
193
197

It will be noted that the set of basic terms presented above lacks all collateral terms as well as a gCh term. Our data on collateral terms are incomplete for many groups, so that negative evidence here is of relatively little value, but it would seem that no root or roots for xC have been developed. The only root of any extension here is *ning, which appears in Kachin (xCe,ws), Chang (xC), Mikir BW(ws), and perhaps Garo (Sbl). The Mikir and Garo affinal meanings can be explained in terms of cross-cousin marriage.

Three or perhaps four TB roots show a tendency to equate N with gCh. Tibetan ts'a Ne (probably S1S,ms),gCh furnishes an example of this tendency. Bahing and Newari have this root (*ts'a) in the meaning "gS", but in the Kiranti languages in general it is used for "S" (see the discussion in pt. 4). Khasuri e'ad S1 (with suffixed -d) has been brought into comparison via S1S(ms), equated with S1 under cross-cousin marriage. Kachin ta'a MB,MBS(ws) can be explained only on the basis of a reciprocal development from S1S(ms). Mikir o-sa S1S(ms),S1 shows an ideal agreement on the semantic side, but the comparison is phonetically dubious. The root *ts'a appears to be lacking in other groups.

SA

601

● 193

197

ST

601

193

197

The roots *su and *tu have distributions which are almost, if not quite, mutually exclusive. *su gCh appears in Kachin, Bodo, Mikir, and Meithei, while *tu appears in Nung (N), Burmish-Loloish (xN), and Eukiah (FSiCh, SiCh, ms, gCh). Anu, a Southern Euki language, has su xC, ySi(wa), SiCh(wa), gCh, and a-su-lai SiCh(ms), covering much the same ground as Eukiah *tu. The roots *su and *tu must be regarded as distinct on general phonetic grounds, and this view is strengthened by the evidence from Meithei, which has i-su gCh as well as (ma-)tu w (cf. the Euki use of *tu in the meaning "SI", through cross-cousin marriage). The root *su is perhaps also represented in the Naga languages, in much the same setting as Anu su, viz. Angami su ~ tsu FSiS, ySiS(ms), gS, Nsong Rengma a-su-gü, Ntenyi Rengma a-su-wa, Anyo Rengma a-sü FSiCh, SiCh(ms), gCh, but our knowledge of Naga phonology is not sufficiently advanced to establish this comparison.

A fourth root of the same general type is *ma-li, which is found in Nung (gCh), Burmish-Loloish (gCh), Pyu (gCh), Chang (xN), Garo (SiS, ms), Mikir (xN, probably BCh, wa), and has an additional cognate in Kachin (ma-li "young man"). This root is in general lacking in Eukiah, but may be represented by Taungtha lwi Me, Ni and Yindu (ka-)li BD(wa). It cannot be traced in Tibetan or any of the northern languages.

The affinal root corresponding to *mak Si is perhaps *nam Di, but the evidence for the latter root is not altogether satisfactory. Lepcha has nyom < *snam Di paralleling nyok < *mak Si, and s- prefixed forms are also represented by

- SA Kanauri stem < *snan (probably for snam) D1, and Barish
601 *snan D1 (based on Dimas ba-ham, Garo nam). Cf. also
●193 Gyarung snom < *snan S1, Burmese hnam < *snan yS1(ms)
197 (inferred from mong-hnam "H and W", where mong means "yB,wa"),
ST Lashi tu-nam D1, nam-mo yS1(ms), Nyi nō-mo < *nam-mo yS1(ms),
601 and Lushai hnam < *snam "clan". The unprefix form appears
193 in Byangsi nam-sia D1, Kachin nam D1, yS1, and Nung nam Sb,
197 while Lepcha has both nyom < *snam D1 and nom < *nam oS1.
Magari ar-nam "girl" also belongs in this series.

Of more restricted distribution are the roots *mou D1, represented by Kukish mou (Lushai mo), Meithei i-mau, and perhaps Tibetan mo "woman", and *k'rwī S1, represented by Kachin k'ri S1, SiCh(ms), Burmese k'rwē³-ma' < *k'rwī³-ma', Lisu c'i-ma D1 (with feminine suffix -ma), and perhaps Lepcha tā-gri "male". The original meanings of these roots may have been simply "female" and "male", respectively.

There remain for consideration a few poorly represented roots connected primarily with the PSb nomenclature. Nung a-tsim MS1 is comparable with Tsangla a-sim, id., and Nung a-wang FB with Garo a-wang FyB, also Lashi vang-mo HF, FoSiH, Maru vung ~ vun HF, FS1H (but the Lashi and Maru terms suggest a meaning "MB" rather than "FB"). The *wang series is perhaps connected with Tibetan 'a-bang FS1H, MS1H (literary), Limbu (am-)pang-a "uncle", Vayu pong-pong < *pang-pang FB.

Tibetan aru MS1 has been compared with Kanauri and Chamba Lahuli ru Fl, Pyu aru "relatives", and the reconstructed

SA Lolo root *ru MB. If these terms actually constitute a true
601 series, we must reconstruct a root *aru ~ *ru "mother's
● 193 relatives" (neuter), whence Kanauri ru Fl < MB through cross-
197 cousin marriage, paralleling Kanauri o'ad S1 < S1S(ms). The
ST presence of this root in Pyu, at approximately the year
601 A.D. 1000, lends some weight to this view.

193 The fourth Tibetan PSb term, viz. [√]a-zang MB, is found
197 in this form in Thebor and Lepcha, where it must be regarded
as a loan-word, but not elsewhere. This form can be derived
from an original *zrang and thus compared with Mru ta-rang
FS1H, HF, Kukish ta-rang ~ ma-rang, id., and probably Lhota
o-grā, Changki (Ao) (kdi-)hram B1(ws). Burmese a-hrang < *arang
(archaic spelling is a-hsyang) "lord, master" also perhaps
belongs here rather than with sring-mo S1 (supra). The
writer has long suspected that Tibetan initial [√]z- and [√]s- have
in many instances been derived from zr- and sr-, respectively,
partly because of the general instability of these clusters
in Tibetan (cf. srab-srib ~ hrab-hrib ~ rab-rib "dim, obscure"),
and partly on the basis of comparative material, viz. Tib. [√]sig
"louse", Bunan [√]arig, Lushai hrík < *srik; Tib. [√]zag "day (24
hours)", Burmese rak, id.; Tib. [√]sags "joke, jest" (in sense
of "ridicule"), Bunan [√]arag "shame", Burmese hrak < *srak
"to be ashamed". The root *-rang (prefixed) must have had a
generalized honorific force (still retained in Burmese), and
thus was admirably suited as a periphrastic term either for
MB or for FS1H, HF (= MB under cross-cousin marriage).

SA Having completed our review of Tibeto-Burman kinship
601 roots, we are now faced with the problem of fixing the basic
193 pattern of nomenclature for this linguistic family. The terms
197 designating relatives in the central line of descent naturally
ST form the most stable segment of the nomenclature, while the
601 collateral terms show an intermediate, and the affinal terms
193 a maximum, amount of variation.

197 Within this stable core of nomenclature we are able to
distinguish two primary gP terms (gN and gF), two primary P
terms (M and F), a neuter ySb term, and a neuter Oh term. The
two neuter terms are often employed in a masculine sense (yS
and S), with sex affixes used in forming the corresponding
feminine terms (ySi and D), e.g. Tibetan bu S, bu-no D,
Burmese sa³ S, sa-mi³ D. No neuter P terms have been uncovered,
but Chang has a neuter gP term (a-pi < ap'i gN) used only
in address, and a neuter gF term is also found in Sema
(a-pu-sa), and in the Southern Kuki languages Sho (a-pö) and
Ayaing Khani (a-un-si). Three Southern Kuki languages
(Chinok, Yindu, Anu) make a distinction between FN and MN,
but have a single term for gF (Anu FN < N, MN < gN). Four
gF terms appear only in rare instances, and are never all
primary. Both Tibetan and Khamuri show traces of three or
four gP terms, but Khamuri has probably borrowed one or more
of its gP terms from Tibetan, and the Tibetan material itself
can be interpreted in more than one way. Kachin seems to
employ four gP terms, perhaps because of Shan influence, but
has only two primary terms (ji gF and woi gN). Gare distinguishes

SA between "gP" (= FF) and "gH" (= FH), and "my gP" (= MF) and
601 "my gH" (= MH), if we can trust our sources for this language.
● 193 In view of the fact that the Garo are a matrilineal group,
197 this point is of some interest. Chang, which uses the neuter
ST term a-pi gP in address, employs four terms in reference, the
601 FF and FH terms being formed through affixed sex elements,
193 and the MF and MH terms through analysis. Finally, Laiyo,
197 which has an almost exclusively analytical nomenclature,
employs four analytical gP terms.

A number of different arrangements of Sb terms have been encountered. Age distinctions appear everywhere and are, in general, more prominent than sex distinctions. Despite this, however, it would appear that the basic pattern has two primary terms for oB and oSi, contrasting with the single neuter ySb term (*nan). As has been shown above, the widespread tendency to equate oB and oSi with terms for relatives of ascending generations has obscured the general picture here and has made analysis almost impossible. The simplest possible arrangement (oSb and ySb) has been found only in Khani (Ayaing and Awa) and Anyo Rengma. A single primary term for oSb appears also in Kuki proper (u) and in Burmese (ats-), but Burmish-Loloish in general has two primary oSb terms. Nsong Rengma shows a complete reversal of the ordinary pattern, with terms for oSb, yB, and ySi. Tibetan, Lepcha, Dafia, Kachin, Aka, Lisu, Chang, Chinbon, Ao and probably other less accurately recorded languages have what appears to be the basic arrangement, viz. oB, oSi, and ySb (three primary

SA terms). The Barish languages in general employ the root *nau
601 yB in the meaning "ySi" and have developed a new term for yB
● 193 (perhaps connected with the Kachin term for B,ws), while
197 Meithei reverses this process in employing *nau for "yB" and
ST the Kuki root *sai-Si(ms) for ySi. Simple terms for either
601 B or Si are almost entirely lacking in Tibeto-Burman. Abor-
193 Miri has terms for B and Si based on a root *buir (cf. a-buir
197 "friend"), while in Dafia the cognate form *bör is used as the
root for yBb, but note that Abor-Miri also possesses especial
terms for oBb and yBb. Mikir bor Sb, like Abor-Miri buir,
also has the more general meaning "friend".

Though the principle of age distinctions can be established
as a basic feature of Tibeto-Burman kinship terminology, the
status of sex-of-speaker distinctions is not so readily settled.
We are handicapped here by the fact that most of our sources
can not be depended upon in showing non-European distinctions
of this type, and that negative evidence is therefore of
little value. Distinct terms for Si(ms) and B(ws) are found
in Tibetan, Kachin, Lushai and Lakhèr (and probably other Kuki
languages), and Angami. Lushai and Lakhèr also have a distinct
term (of periphrastic origin) for Si(ws). In Burmese and Nyl
the distinction is applied only to yBb, viz. Burmese yB(ms),
yB(ws), ySi(ws), ySi(ms), Nyl yBb(ms), yB(ws), ySi(ms), and Maru,
in the same linguistic group, has a distinct term for yB(ws).
Mikir distinguishes between oSi(ws) and oSi(ms), and has a
distinct term for B(ws). Chinbok and Yindu, in the Southern

SA Nahi group, have a full set of eight sb terms, showing complete
601 distinctions both for age and for sex-of-speaker. The Chinok
193 system can be reduced to five primary terms, viz. pai oSi(we),
197 uae oS(ne), nau ySh(us), be si(us), and bang B(we), i.e. the
ST Tibetan-Kachin arrangement. Sex of speaker appears not to be
601 distinguished in Khamuri, Abor-Miri, Dafia, Barish, Meithei,
193 and some other languages; but our sources, as mentioned above,
197 are not of the most dependable sort. In view of the weight
of evidence above, from such key languages as Tibetan, Kachin,
Burmese, Mikir, and Lushai, the writer is inclined to regard
the sex-of-speaker distinction as an archaic Tibeto-Burman
feature.

Despite the fact that no single gCh root can with
certainty be reconstructed for Tibeto-Burman, one can surely
regard the presence of a primary gCh term as a basic feature
for this linguistic family. Aside from the tendency to
equate gCh with H or C (vide infra), it can be stated that
most Tibeto-Burman languages have a distinct, usually primary,
term for gCh, e.g. Kachin ^vsu, Burmese mwe³, Byangai k'we,
Khamuri e'ay, Lepcha a-sen, Chang ^vsi, Garo and Mikir su,
Meithei i-su. If a single gCh root must be predicated, TB *su
must be regarded as the most likely selection. Equations of
gCh other than with H are exceptional, but note Sema a-mu gCh=
Ch[< TB *nau ySh).

The above discussion is resumed in the following diagram:

SA
601
● 193
197
ST
601
193
197

Tibeto-Burman Basic Pattern

gN (*p'i)		gF (*p'u)
M (*ma)		F (*p'a)
oSi(ws)	y3b (*nan)	oc(ms)
Si(ms)		B(ws)
	Ch (*za)	
	gCh	

It would be a rather hazardous undertaking to attempt any general explanation of the pattern outlined above in terms of sociological factors. A broad theory of this type must be based on a comprehensive comparative survey of Tibeto-Burman with a number of other groups, and as such lies outside the scope of the present study. Many of the variations from this pattern are undoubtedly significant, but they involve those elusive culture-linguistic intangibles which do not lend themselves to arm-chair analysis. It is only in the collateral and affinal nomenclatures that obvious cultural correlations are available, and it is these that the writer proposes to consider in some detail.

The distinction between cross (FSi and MSi) and parallel (FB and MBi) F3b terms is almost universal in Tibeto-Burman. No instances of an equation of FB with MB have been encountered, but FSi and MSi are equated in Bahing, Lepcha, and Chinbon, if we can trust our sources. Note that Lepcha also equates xC with pC, and that cross-cousin marriage is forbidden in this tribe.

SA The parallel FB and MSi terms are usually either equated
601 with the F and M terms (as in Chang, Lushai, Angami, Sema) or
● 193 are based on these terms, with the addition of elements meaning
197 "big" and "little" or the like. In other words, age distinc-
ST tions are made in the parallel PSb terms precisely as in the
601 Sb terms, though with categorical rather than primary elements.
193 By way of contrast, the cross PSb terms seldom show these age
197 distinctions, but note Burmese u³-ri³ MoB (cf. a-ri³ FB1),
u³-mang³ MyB, Chinbok pu-ar³ MoB (= gF), pu-ko MyB (these
distinctions are typical of Southern Kuki in general). Some
of the more characteristic examples of age distinctions in
FB terms are listed below:

<u>Language</u>	<u>FB</u>	<u>FyB</u>
Balti	a-ta ts'ar-ma	a-ta tsun-tso
Lepcha	a-bo-tin	a-bo-gum
Kachin	wa-di	wa-doi
Burmese	p' ^u a-kri ³	p' ^u a-t'we ³
Nyi	a-ba-giā	a-ba-ŋe
Haka	pa-u	pa-nau
Siyin	pa-lien	pa-no
Chinbon	pa k-dōu	pa k-ovi
Tangkhuil	a-va k' ^u a-rar ^u	a-va ka-tui
Lhota	o-po-ra-mo	o-po-ro

One occasionally encounters what seem to be primary terms
for FB or MSi, but most of these can be explained on the basis
of ellipsis, e.g. Maru t'ong MySi but nye-t'ang MySi,

SA p'a-t'ang FyB in the closely related Lashi language; Bodo
601 a-yong FoB and a-doi FyB, but ma-gung MoSi and ma-doi MySi;
● 193 Hmong Rengma a-nyo FyB (nyo Ch), and perhaps Changki (Ao)
197 a-sa FyB < *sa Ch. Kanauri has a curious diminutive forma-
ST tion, viz. a-mats MSi < a-ma, and a-pats FB < a-pa. Tibetan
601 and Nung, however, appear to have four true PSb terms. The
193 Nung terms a-tsim MSi and a-wang FB have been compared with
197 Tsangla a-sin MSi and Garo a-wang FyB, respectively. The
Tibetan term sru MSi seems to have been derived from a root
with the generalized meaning "mother's relatives", or
"member of mother's clan, first ascending generation".
Tibetan k'u FB, it can now be stated, has been developed
from the TB root *k'u MB, and the Himalayish and Lepcha
employment of this term in its Tibetan setting must be
credited to Tibetan influence, which is conspicuous in both
of these areas. Tibetan skud < *k'u Fl, Bl is to be explained
in terms of xC marriage and the equation of MB with WF, as
elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman. Tibetan 'a-ne PSi, MEW further
fits into this picture. In Himalayish, Kanauri ru Fl < *sru
MSb, and c'ed Bl < *ts'a SiS(me) suggest a like reconstruction.
We have some material on xC marriage in the Tibetan area,
but the term skud itself is, for the writer, the most signifi-
cant single piece of evidence. Those who minimize the value
of linguistic "fossils" in general might well take note of
this term.

The semantic shift FB < MB in the Tibetan term k'u still
requires explanation. Elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman the term has

SA been demoted to affinal rank or dropped altogether, but
601 nowhere else has it been applied to FB. Now there is but
● 193 one marital feature in which the Tibetan area (including
197 the Kanauri group of Himalayish) significantly differs from
ST the remaining Tibeto-Burman area, viz. polyandry. Fraternal
601 polyandry of Tibetan type is practised by the Kanauri, almost
193 certainly through Tibetan influence, since this custom is
197 explicitly stated to be absent among the Almora peoples
(Byangsi, Chaudangsi, Johar). Among the Lepcha polyandry is
an abnormal trait and can unhesitatingly be assigned a Tibetan
origin. Among other Tibeto-Burman group for which we have any
record, polyandry either is said to be lacking or is simply
not mentioned. Since Tibetan polyandry is of fraternal type,
the importance of FB can readily be understood. It would seem
that the MB term, which is unstable in most TB groups, was
first replaced by the honorific term [√]ʼa-[√]yang and later applied
to FB. The collective term skud-po F1, B1, having already been
semantically specialized in an affinal sense, was naturally
retained.

Primary cross PSb terms are basic TB features, and are
represented by the roots *ni FS1 and *k'u MB. The first of
these two terms, however, is much more stable than the second,
and significantly so (if statistically treated). Thus, Tibetan
has transferred the MB term to FB and used an honorific for
MB; Burmish-Loloish has retained the MB term only as an
honorific applied to oB (in Burmese) or as an affinal term

SA (Ahi, Moso) and has developed new terms for MB (Burmese u³,
601 Lolo *ru); the Kuki languages proper have dropped the MB term
● 193 altogether and equated MB with gP; in the Naga group the MB
197 term has been preserved in its original setting only in Ao,
ST while in Rengma and Sema it has been retained only in the
601 affinal nomenclature. All of these groups, however, have the
193 root *ni FSI in its original setting. Burmese (but not
197 Burmish-Loloish) has replaced both the FSI and MB terms and
dropped the former altogether, while Kachin has retained both
terms only in its affinal nomenclature. The relatively
greater stability of the FSI term is also evident in the
borrowings made by various TB groups (infra).

This "differential variability" in the FSI and MB terms
must be viewed in connection with the affinal application of
these terms and the whole problem of cross-cousin marriage.
Under bilateral xC marriage MB becomes F1, and FSI becomes
M1, and it is not unlikely that honorific terms should become
associated with these socially "pivotal" relationships. The
fact that the MB=F1 term is more susceptible to this process
than is the FSI=M1 term merely reflects the general patri-
lineal bias of Tibeto-Burman societies. The equation of MB
with gP, which plays so prominent a role in Kukiish, repre-
sents one aspect of this whole development, but teknonymy may
also be a factor here ("F1" designated as "gP of my son").
Teknonymy is hardly typical of Tibeto-Burman yet does
occasionally occur. Lepcha, for example, employs a-bo F for F1

SA where the couple are childless, but t'i-kung gF after the
601 birth of a child, and the descriptive term a-fyat Fl has been
193 derived from an original *sput, which in turn represents a
197 morphological development from the TB root *p'u gF. Vayu
ST ca-k'i Fl appears to be a combination of co < *ca Ch and
601 ki-ki gF. Lahu, in the Southern Lolo group, has a-p'u gF=Fl,
193 a-p'i gM=MI, and Ahi, in the Northern Lolo group, has
197 su-p'o WF, also "paternal ancestor". The Chang Sbl terms are
of teknonymous origin, e.g. hau-ko Bl(ms)="his WF", but the
Chang Fl terms are simply Fl=MB and MI=FSI. Chinbon equates
WF with gF, and WM with gM (rather than with MF and MBW, as
in most Kuki languages), but retains the Kuki pattern in the
HM and HF terms (HF=FSI, and especial term for HF), i.e.
the teknonymous (or honorific) terms are employed only by the
husband. The Mirish languages (Abor, Miri, Dafia) afford the
best illustration of teknonymy. In Miri the terms a-bu and
a-nu are used for F and M, respectively, but in the closely
related Abor language these terms are applied to gF and gM,
though ta-ta (Miri ts-to gF) is retained as the vocative term
for gF. In this instance the child has taken over his
parents' terms ("reverse teknonymy") rather than the parent
his childrens' terms. Abor also uses the vocative gF term
(ta-ta) for Fl, while Miri equates Fl either with gF or with
MB, and MI either with gM or with FSI (the equations with MB
and FSI are probably only descriptive, though this is not
stated in our sources). Dafia equates MI with gM, probably
also Fl with gF.

SA
601
● 193
197
ST
601
193
197
Under a system of bilateral xC marriage we should expect to find both WF and HF equated with MB, and both WM and HM equated with FSi. This condition is fulfilled in Byangai and Abor-Miri, where this type of marriage is in vogue. The terminological equation also appears, however, in Nung, Chang, Sema, Nsong Rengma, and Lhota, for all of which preferential MBD marriage is indicated, and in Tangkhul and Angami, for which xC marriage cannot be established.

A system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD should lead to the equation of WF with MB, HM with FSi, and separate terms for HF and WM, as well as distinctions between FSiH and MB, MBW and FSi. Kachin fulfills all these conditions admirably, with unilateral xC marriage coupled with the terminological equations indicated above. The same can be said for the Kuki pattern, as illustrated in Lakher, Thado, Chawto, Tarau, as well as in Mru and Khami, viz. $WF=MB$, $WM=MBW$, $HM=FSi$, $HF=FSiH$. Unilateral MBD marriage is found among the Thado, Chiru, Anal, Aimol, Furum, and probably the Anal, She, and Khami. In Thado this nomenclature is employed only where MBD marriage has actually occurred, P terms being employed under other conditions.

Mtenyi and Anyo Rengma have an intermediate type, with $MI=FSi$ but $WF=MB$ and a distinct term for HF, but in both languages the MB term is sometimes applied to HF as well as to WF. The closely related Nsong Rengma has a single term for F1 ($WF, HF=MB$), but retains a distinct term for FSiH. Sema has the same scheme as Nsong Rengma. The Sema term for FSiH,

SA furthermore, is cognate with the Ntanyi and Anyo Rengma term
601 for HF, and in Ao the same term appears in its original
● 193 setting (MB). This Naga material thus shows various stages
197 of the transformation of the affinal terminology through the
ST development of unilateral xC marriage. The discrepancies
601 found in Nung, Chang, and Lhota are perhaps more apparent than
193 real, and in the case of Nung and Lhota, at any rate, our
197 sources may be faulty. Even in these affinal features, how-
ever, we must expect to find a certain amount of disassocia-
tion, for we must allow for linguistic "lag", i.e. the simple
scheme of equating F1 with MB and M1 with FSI tends to be
perpetuated even where the development of a unilateral "skew"
has rendered it theoretically illogical. This general point
has been raised many times before, but will bear repetition
in view of the fact that a number of modern theoreticians
seem to object to this sort of reasoning.

It is fairly evident that the abandonment of xC marriage
as an institutionalized norm has in several different groups
resulted in the disappearance of categorical equations. In
Tibetan and Khasuri we have only the "fossilized" terms
skud-po and ru, respectively, which require comparative studies
for a full appraisal of their significance. In Lahul, however,
where we have a hint of xC marriage, the equations $F1=MB$ and
 $M1=FS1$ are in evidence. In Burmese itself categorical equa-
tions are lacking, and here also we have no evidence of xC
marriage, but the situation is reversed in Arakanese (Chaungtha).

SA Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, equate ML with FSi,
601 WF with MB, and have a distinct term for FSiH, HF (as in Maeng
● 193 and Anyo Rengma). Kachin influence perhaps plays a role here,
197 yet the Kachin distinguish between WM and HM, as is consistent
ST with their unilateral xC marriage practice. Nyl, in the
601 Northern Lolo group, has derived its terms for WF and WM from
193 the terms for MB and FSi, respectively, plus the element mo
197 "old", acting here as an honorific, while the Burmish-Loloish
affinal root *yok is employed in the terms for HM and HF. .Ahi
seems to reverse this scheme, to judge from our faulty data
on this language. For Lisu we have only what appear to be
the vocative terms for F1 and M1 (na-na < a-na M, ba-ba < a-ba F),
and hence are not in a position to interpret this Lolo material.
The use of respectful designations may be a complicating
factor here; cf. Lushai pu-son WF, pi-son WM, conforming to
the Kuki pattern (from pu MB and pi MBW plus an added element
-son), but pa HF (= F) and nu HM (= M), i.e. a woman equates
her husband's relatives with her own blood kin.

Categorical equations in the P1 terms are present else-
where, but our sources are often incomplete. Garo equates M1
with FSi, MBW, but has a distinct term for F1 (a-bu-di, perhaps
"little gF"). Mikir equates WF with MB, WM with FSi (with
or without the addition of an honorific suffix), and has a
distinct term for HF. If we assume that HM (not given in our
sources) is also equated with FSi, this system can be compared
with that found in Rengma and Maru. Both Garo and Mikir have

SA preferential MBD marriage. Meithei equates M1 with F81, and
601 has 1-kn F1 < TB *k'u MB (the MB term is not known for sure,
● 193 but may be the Indic loan-word mānā); the Meithei are not
197 known to practice xC marriage.
ST The rest of the collateral terminology (C and N terms)
601 is even more poorly known than the PSb terminology, and
193 presents even more serious problems. In view of the presence
197 of basic TB roots for MB (*k'u) and F81 (*ni) one might expect
to find one or more roots for xC, but such is hardly the case.
The extension of Sb terms to include pC is practically uni-
versal and need not be examined in detail. The lack of
especial xC terms is probably associated with the lack of xC
marriage, but there are too many lacunae in our data to permit
of any final judgment here. Tibetan apparently fails to
distinguish between pC and xC, but Burmese perhaps has a
distinct xC term (sa-mi³-mrok-sa³, lit. "D's spouse!"). By
way of contrast, Chaungtha, one of the Arakanese dialects,
has yauk-pa B1, xC corresponding to Burmese yok-p'a³ B1(ms),
in conformity with its equation of F1 with MB and M1 with
F81, i.e. an affinal term has "invaded" the consanguineal
nomenclature.

Terms for xCe and xCi in conjunction with xC marriage
are found in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Wiri, Lisu, and Chang,
while Dafia has this terminological pattern but without data
on xC marriage. Chang appears to have preferential MBD
marriage, but the bilateral type is found among the others.

SA Byangsi-Chaudangsi makes a sex-of-speaker distinction, viz.
601 xCi(ms), xCe(ws), xC(ss), and Abor-Miri makes an age dis-
193 tinction. None of the terms involved is associated with a
197 PSb term or a N term. The Abor-Miri terms show "invasion"
ST from the affinal terminology, as in Chaungtha, e.g. nag-bo
601 xCe(os) = oBl, Sl, from TB *mak Sl. Note that in Byangsi-
193 Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, and Chang this xC pattern is associated
197 with the simple Pl = PSb categorical equations (for Lisu we
lack full information on the Pl terms).

Cross-cousin terminologies of Omaha type are found in two primary foci, viz. Kachin and Kukish. The correlation between the Omaha nomenclature and patrilineal descent, one of the few widely-accepted anthropological generalizations, obtains both among the Kachin and the various Kuki and Naga tribes. Of the Tibeto-Burman peoples only the Garo and Nabha, in the Barish group, are known to have matrilineal descent, and unfortunately we know nothing of the cousin terminology in use among these tribes. There is a hint of the Crow type of terminology in Bodo, also in the Barish group, but we cannot be sure that the Bodo reckon descent in the matrilineal line. Bodo (nang-)a-doi "(thy) oBCh", (a-)doi FyB show reciprocity, as has already been pointed out, but Bodo nam-ba-noi "(thy) SiS", (nang-)a-noi "(thy) SiD", and a-noi FSi cannot be explained on this basis and suggest rather the Crow pattern. It is greatly to be regretted that our Garo sources fail us at this critical point.

SA The Kachin system, which is quite distinct from that found
601 in Kukiash, merits special examination. The key terms are as

● 193 follows:

197

ST

601 moi FSI

ts'a MB, MBS(ws)

193 ning xC1(ws)

k'an xC2(ms)

197 k'r1 FSI D(ms), S1Ch(ms)

rat MBD(oms)

nam MBD(yms), BCh(ws)

(Affinal)

ni WL, MBW, WBW

ku HF, FSIH, HoB, oSIH(ws)

moi HM

ts'a WF, BWB(ws)

ning HSI, BW(ws)

k'au WB, S1H(ms)

nam D1, WyS1, ySW(ms), WBCh

k'r1 S1, HSICh, FSIHS1

rat WoS1, yS1H(ws), oBW(ms), HyB

The main features of this system have already been discussed in pt. 7. It will be observed that the lineal equations characteristic of the Omaha pattern appear only in the terms for non-marriageable cross-cousins under the Kachin unilateral xC marriage arrangement, i.e. a man equates his (non-marriageable) FSI D with his S1Ch, while a woman equates her (non-marriageable) MBS with her MB. The terms applied by a woman to her (marriageable) FSI S are not known, but a man equates his (marriageable) MBD with his WS1. Distinct terms are used by speakers of each sex for xC(ss).

SA On the basis of comparative material, the terms nam and
601 k'ri must be regarded as originally affinal (D1 and S1,
193 respectively). Both terms have "invaded" the consanguineal
197 nomenclature via the categorical equations $D1 = BD(ws)$ and
ST $S1 = S1S(ms)$, as are consistent with the practice of MBD
601 marriage. Note that both terms have become neuter in the
193 course of this transformation. We must next enquire of the
197 fate of the original xN terms thus displaced. The terms
moi FSi and ts'a MB can be called upon at this point. We
lack comparative material on moi, but Tibetan has ts'a S1S(ms)
corresponding to the Kachin term, and we can therefore inter-
pret Kachin ts'a MB as a product of reciprocal usage. We have
conclusive support for this view in the term k'ri HSiCh, FSiHSi,
which at first puzzled the writer. Under the Kachin tri-
partite organization, as described by Gilhodes, FSiHSi becomes
MBW, and MBW ~ HSiCh are reciprocal terms. Since moi FSi
closely parallels ts'a MB, we are justified in interpreting
this term analogically as a reciprocal development from BD(ws).

To continue our analysis, moi and ts'a have displaced the
original cross PSb terms ni and ku, which are retained in the
affinal nomenclature. An original system of bilateral xC
marriage must be postulated to account for ni W_L, MBW < FSi,
and ku HF, FSiH < MB. The categorical equations shown by
ning xCi(ws) = S1l(ws) and k'au xCe(ms) = B1(ms) also call for
this type of marriage.

To complete our reconstruction, the terms ning, k'au,
and rat must be regarded as originally consanguineal rather

SA than affinal. We have comparative material only for ming,
601 which is represented by Chang (Konyak) nyang < *ning xC,
• 193 Mikir nang < *ning BW(ws). We must further reconstruct rat
197 as the term for xC(ds), i.e. the marriageable xC under the
ST original bilateral xC marriage arrangement. This yields the
601 theoretical categorical equations $xCi(ms) = Si1(ms)$ and $xCe(ws) =$
193 $Bi1(ws)$. Under the conventional type of levirate, which is
197 found among the Kachin, a distinction must be made between
the (marriageable) oBW and the (non-marriageable) yEW. In
Kachin this distinction is made, in the case of a man, by
equating yEW with D1 (nam) and in retaining the term rat for
oBW, and, in the case of a woman, by equating HoB with HF (ku)
and in retaining the term rat for HyB. Since a man marries
his MED, the distinction between rat MED(oms) and nam MED(yms)
is the natural result of that described above. It is a fair
inference that the missing terms for FS1S(ws) are ku FS1S(ows)
and rat FS1S(yws). Note that the equation of MED(yms) with
BCh(ws) is a by-product, so to speak, and is not to be taken
as a 'Crow' feature.

We are now in a position to evaluate the Omaha features
of the Kachin system. It has been demonstrated that the Kachin
have developed a unilateral xC marriage system from an original
bilateral arrangement, and that this shift has produced a
profound transformation in the kinship terminology. The
equating of MBS(ws) with XB, and of FS1D(ms) with SiCh(ms)
serves to distinguish the non-marriageable from the marriageable

SA cross-cousins. These equations closely parallel those already
601 noted in the Sbl terminology, and appear to form part of the
193 same pattern. If this inference be correct, we must regard
197 the institution of the levirate as a contributing factor here.

ST The Kachin terminology under the original bilateral xC
601 marriage system can be reconstructed as follows:

Reconstructed Kachin System

(Consanguineal)

ni	FS1	ku	MB
ning	xCi(ws)	k'au	xCe(ms)
		rat	xC(ds)
wol	BD(ws)	ts'a	S1B(ms)

(Affinal)

ni	MBW, M1	ku	FS1H, F1
ning	S11(ss)	k'au	B1(ss)
		rat	Sbl(ds)
nam	D1	k'ri	S1

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, show Omaha features of Kachin type, e.g. Lashi so-ok FS1D(ms), SiCh(ms) and so-auk S1 (a variant of so-ok), directly comparable with the Kachin term k'ri. Our material here is too uncertain to justify any further investigation of this point, and we have no data on the Maru and Lashi marriage practices. Both tribes are closely identified with the Kachin, and have even incorporated Kachin loan-words into their kinship nomenclatures, so that direct Kachin influence must be reckoned with in this

SA matter. To judge from what little we know of the collateral
601 terms of other Burmish-Loloish languages, Omaha features are
● 193 not present. There is some evidence suggesting that the root
197 *tu is applied both to N and C in Lisu and in Ulu (Northern
ST Lolo), but the Lisu material is inconsistent and the Ulu
601 material is not precise

193 The Omaha nomenclatures found among the Kuki tribes
197 are quite distinct in type from the Kachin nomenclature. The
Kuki tribes proper, including Southern Kuki and Tangkhul,
employ the following basic scheme (in many varieties):

Kuki Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

pi gH,MBD

pu gF,MB,MB3

ni FSi

tu FSiCh, SiCh(ws), gCh

(Affinal)

pi MBT, TL, TS1

pu TF, TB

ni HM

-rang FSiH, HF

mou DL, BT(ws)

mak Sl, SiH(ws)

Lushai has an especial term for BCh(ws), viz. va²
(apparently connected with the root *wa H), and Yindu has an
especial term for BD(ws), viz. (ka-)li, which has been com-
pared with the root *na-li gCh (Burmese, Mung), an (Mikir).
In Siyin and Chawto, however, BCh(ws) is equated with Ch.
The analyzing development in Laiyo has entirely obliterated
all traces of the Omaha system, yet the term tu FSiCh is

SA retained. Haka has both (k-)tu FS1Ch and the analytical term
601 (k-)ni fa as an alternative. Lakher applies Sb terms (in
● 193 address) to FS1Ch and occasionally to MBCh, and both Thado
197 and Aimol sometimes apply the oSb term to FS1Ch(os). Chinbok
ST employs an analytical term for MBS, but equates MBD with MyS1.
601 Thado resembles Chinbok in equating MBD with MS1, but elsewhere
193 the regular equation is with MBW=gM. Chinbok is further
197 aberrant in equating FS1S with S1S(ms) but having a distinct
term for gS. Yindu equates DS with S1S,FS1S, but employs an
analytical term for SS. Yindu has distinct terms for MBCh,
and Kyaw has distinct terms both for MBCh and FS1Ch(i.e.
Omaha features are lacking). Aimol, if we can trust our
sources, has reversed the Kuki pattern, with (ka-)pu FS1S
and (ka-)tu-pa MBS. Chinbon has MoBS=MyS, MyBS=WB, reflect-
ing the stress placed on age distinctions in Southern Kuki.
Our Chawte material, which is not reliable, indicates a
distinction between FS1S(ws) and FS1D(ms), and the equation
of S1Ch(mws) with gCh. The affinal term mak S1 is commonly
replaced by the consanguineal term tu S1S(ms), as in Haka,
Chawte, and Sho, and the reverse process whereby an affinal
term "invades" the consanguineal nomenclature (as in Kachin)
is illustrated by Kyaw sa-mak S1Ch^u(ms)=S1, and Ayaing Khami
mok-sa FS1Ch,S1Ch(ms)=S1, both from the root *mak S1. The
latter language has retained the root *tu, however, in the
term (ka-)tu FS1Ch(ws),gS.

It is evident from the above citations that this Omaha
pattern is extremely susceptible to variation at all points.

SA Nothing approaching the specific Kachin variety has been
 601 encountered, however, and the two systems seem to have little
 193 in common. In the Kuki system the equations $FSiCh = SiCh(ms)$
 197 and $MB = MB$ obtain regardless of the sex or speaker, there are
 ST additional equations of MB with g^F and $SiCh(ms)$ with gCh ,
 601 and ni FSi is retained as a consanguineal term. In addition,
 193 distinct terms for $xL(ss)$ and Sbl are lacking. The historical
 197 developments of the two systems have been quite different, if
 we are permitted to draw inferences from comparative data.
 The terms pi and pu are the original g^F terms (TB $*p'i$ g^F ,
 $*p'u$ g^F), and the term $-rang$ (prefixed) can be regarded as the
 original term for MB, cognate with Tibetan $*a-zang < *zrang$ MB
 (cf. Kachin ku HF, $FSiH = MB$). The term tu occasions some
 difficulty, since we have only the Burmish-Loloish root $*tu$
 and the Nung term $pa-du$, both applied to N (xN in Burmese)
 for comparison. In view of the parallelism in the equations
 $MB = g^F$ and $xN = gCh$, however, we must fix the original meaning
 of tu as " gCh " rather than " xN ". The clue to these equations
 seems to be teknonymy in conjunction with xC marriage, i.e.
 we must suppose that a man applied the teknonymous terms pu
 g^F and pi g^F to his wife's parents, whereas a woman applied
 the consanguineal terms ni FSi and $-rang$ MB. With the develop-
 ment of unilateral marriage with MB, a feature found in the
 Kuki area as well as in Kachin, the two sets of Pl terms were
 fully differentiated in function, and the term pu $Fl = g^F$
 replaced the consanguineal term $-rang$ MB, with pi coming into

SA use for MBW. The equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh was the natural
 601 result of the above development. Since the term ni FSi was
 193 retained in its original setting, no comparable term was
 197 developed for the reciprocal relationship BCh(ws). The evidence
 ST for the use of teknonyms terms in Tibeto-Burman in general
 601 has been resumed above and need not be discussed at this point.
 193 Within the Kuki group, note Chinbon (ka-)mo-pauk WH=gF and
 197 (ka-)mu-bok MoB (probably a variant of the foregoing), (ka-)mo
 WM=gM and (ka-)mok MoBW (probably a variant of the foregoing),
 but (ka-)se HF (analysis uncertain), (ka-)si HM=FSi. Chinbon
 thus makes use of teknonyms terms precisely as suggested
 above for the Kuki group in general.

We are still faced with the problem of explaining the
 equations MBS=MB, MBW=MBW (or MSi), and FSiCh=SiCh(ms).
 Here again we must take into account the affinal setting of
 these terms under a system of unilateral xC marriage with MBW.
 The fundamental equation seems to have been that between WF
 and WB (pu) rather than between MB and MBS, i.e. these kin
 were identified because of the similarity of their roles as
 wife's father and brother rather than as mother's brother and
 mother's brother's son. In other terms, the especial position
 of MB and MBS among the Kuki groups seems in large measure to
 have arisen through xC marriage. The equation of FSiCh with
 SiCh(ms) reflects the equation of MBS with MB, just as the
 equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh reflects the equation of MB with gF.

It is possible to conceive of the Kuki development without
 recourse to teknonymy simply by assuming that pu gF was

SA applied to MB and MBS in an honorific sense, with tu gCh
601 SiCh(ms)=FSiCh as a complementary equation. In any event,
193 the equation in the MB line must be regarded as the primary
197 one, and the equation in the FSi line as complementary. The
ST same situation was found to obtain among the Kachin (supra).
601 The Naga languages, which make up the northern division
193 of the Kukish group, also reveal Omaha features, which are of
197 Kuki rather than Kachin type. MBD is equated with MSi or MySi
rather than with gM=MBW. In Ao (all three dialects) the terms
for gF (o-pu) and gCh (sam-cir) are distinct, i.e. there is no
teknonymy, the TB root *k'u is retained in the consanguineal
nomenclature (o-k'u MB,MBS) while MBD is equated with MySi,
and the affinal terms for S1 (a-nok) and D1 (a-mu) are applied
to FSiS,SiS(ms) and FSiD,SiD(ms), respectively, precisely as
in Ayaing Khami. Sema has a distinct term for gF (neuter) and
equates gCh with Ch, but has developed a new root for MB,MBS
(a-ngu) and has retained the root *k'u only in the affinal
meaning "FSiH" (a-ci). Thus both Ao and Sema show full Omaha
features without distinction of sex of speaker (as in Kuki)
but also without teknonymy (as in Kachin). The Angami, Rengma,
and Lhota systems, however, all show teknonymous features.
Rengma (all three dialects) equates MB,MBS(os) with gF (ggF in
Nzong), and FSiCh,SiCh(ms) with gCh. Lhota shows a partial
equation of MB,MBS with gF (o-mo and o-mo-tsd) and at least
similar terms for FSiS,SiS(ms) and gS (o-hro and o-hre).
Angami equates FSiS,ySiS(ms) with gS, but distinguishes between

SA gF and MB, yet the term for the latter (mi) is connected with
 601 the Rengma term for gF, MB (a-mi ~ a-mui) and the Lhota term
 ● 193 for MB (o-mo) and gF (o-mo-tsh). We can thus interpret Angami
 197 mi MB as the original term for gF, MB and in this way explain
 ST the lack of symmetry in the Angami nomenclature as it now
 601 stands (a man calls his sister's child "gCh", but a child
 193 calls his mother's brother "uncle"). Angami lacks the Omaha
 197 traits on one side, since MBCh is addressed or described by
 name, or analytically if the need arises. The Rengma equa-
 tions on the MB side appear only in the vocative nomenclature,
 and only when the cousin (MBS or MBD) addressed is older than
 speaker.

As noted in pt. 16, Majumder attempted to explain some of
 the features of the Sema nomenclature in terms of marriage with
 F's widow, after the fashion instituted by Rivers. Almost no
 instances of marriages of this type have been encountered in
 the Tibeto-Burman area, however, and the writer fails to see
 how Rivers' theories are of any relevancy in the present situ-
 ation. The most curious form of marriage noted is the Lisu
 marriage with FS1 cited by Fraser, and this is not reflected
 in the Lisu nomenclature. Omaha features among the Omaha and
 Miwok are perhaps based on WBD marriage, but for the American
 evidence there is no unanimity of opinion, and at least three
 recent writers on the subject (White, Gifford, Tax) have
 attacked this as a general explanation. Of this trio White
 alone suggests a general explanation, viz. that the Omaha type

SA is developed from the Dakota-Iroquois type ($pC = Sb$, xC distinct
601 term) under the influence of a mature and vigorous patrilineal
● 193 clan system. Gifford has successfully attacked this view on
197 the basis of the American material, and the same general
ST strictures are applicable in the Tibeto-Burman field, where
601 no correlation can be established between strong patrilineal
193 clans and the Omaha type of terminology.
197

The Kuki equation of xN with gCh is also encountered in
Miri ($\ddot{u} < o-i$ "child below") and Tibetan ($ts'a$). Miri has
retained the TB root $*k'u$ MB ($a-kh$), but does apply teknonymy-
mous terms to $F1$ and $M1$ ($= MB$ and $FS1$ under the Miri bilateral
 xC marriage system). In Tibetan, however, teknonymy has been
found only in the dialect of Bathang (eastern Tibet) as
recorded by Desgodins, who cites $rmo-rmo$ $M1 = WM$ (hence a man's
term for his WM). Abor shows reverse teknonymy in the shifts
 $a-bu$ $gF < F$ and $a-na$ $gM < M$, reflected in the equation $o Ch =$
 $N = gCh$ (Abor, like Miri, applies teknonymous terms to $F1$ and $M1$).

SA We are perhaps not justified in concluding that all
601 equations of xN with gCh are based on teknonymy involving the
ST affinal nomenclature ($gF > F1 = MB$), but no better general
601 explanation can be suggested. The general thesis outlined
above conforms to the basic Tibeto-Burman sociological pattern
of cross-cousin marriage, and thus enjoys an initial advantage
over any alternative theories of a more ad hoc nature.

Reciprocal terminology has already been mentioned in
connection with Kachin $ts'a$ $MB < SiCh(ms)$, $k'ri$ $HS1Ch$, $FS1HS1$,